

***Village of Barrington
Plan Commission
Minutes Summary***

Date: May 6, 2003

Time: 7 p.m.

Location: Village Board Room
200 South Hough Street
Barrington, Illinois

In Attendance: Anna Bush, Chair
Curt Larsen, Vice Chair
Bhagwant Sidhu
Harry Burroughs
Steve Mack
Steve Morrissey

Staff Members: Keith Sbiral, Senior Planner
Melanie Marcordes, Recording Secretary

Call to Order

Mrs. Bush called the meeting to order at 7 p.m. The Roll Call noted the following: Anna Bush, Chair, present; Curt Larsen, Vice Chair, present; Bhagwant Sidhu, present; Harry Burroughs, present; Steve Mack, present; John Rometty, absent; Steve Morrissey, present.

There being a quorum, the meeting proceeded.

PC 02-10; Heart-Key Development – 64-70 Ela Road

Consideration of Heart-Key Development will be continued until May 28th.

PC02-05; Wamberg (Plan Commission Deliberations)

Chairperson Bush noted that the Plan Commission has had the opportunity to review the petition further and has looked at the legal opinion provided by Village Attorney Ed Springer.

Chairperson Bush questioned the Petitioner's Attorney Bob Best of Bell, Boyd & Lloyd whether Clark Bardes would still be the tenant, as there are rumors that they have closed their North Barrington office. Mr. Best replied that Clark Bardes is still located in North Barrington and still intend to occupy the first building.

MOTION: Vice-Chairperson Larsen moved and Commissioner Morrissey seconded a motion to approve the statement of findings of fact as follows:

1. The proposed special use listed and authorized in the Zoning District Regulations within which the property is located.
Yes.
2. The proposed special use is consistent with the objectives of the Village's Comprehensive Plan and its ordinance.
No. This proposal is for 6 units. The Comprehensive Plan states that this site is for very low density.
3. The proposed special use is designed, constructed, operated and maintained to be harmonious and appropriate in appearance with the existing or intended character of the vicinity.
Yes.

4. The proposed special use will not significantly diminish the safety, use and enjoyment of surrounding property.
No. The proposed special use adds to the existing traffic congestion within the Village.
5. The proposed special use is adequately served by external public facilities, services, such as streets, police and fire services, drainage, refuse disposal, water and sewer, schools, or person or the agencies responsible for the establishment of the proposed special use shall provide such services.
Yes, with exception to Lot 5.
6. The proposed special use does not create excessive additional requirements at public expense for public facilities and services and not be detrimental to the economic welfare of the community.
No. Although the traffic studies indicate similar levels of service, it will eventually require infrastructure improvements. Those improvements would range anywhere from \$550,000 to \$630,000.
7. The proposed special use does not involve uses, activities, processes, materials, equipment and conditions of operation that would be detrimental to any persons, property or the general welfare by reason of excessive production of traffic noise, smoke, fumes, glares or odors.
No. Traffic will increase as a result of this petition.
8. The proposed special use provides vehicular access to the property design that does not create an interference with traffic on surrounding public thoroughfares.
Yes.
9. The proposed special use does not result in destruction, loss or damage of a natural scenic or historic feature of major importance.
Yes. Because they are being met using conservative design techniques.
10. The proposed special use compliance with all additional regulations in this ordinance specifically in the special use requested.
Yes.
11. Not applicable.
12. Not applicable.
13. Not applicable.
14. The relative gain to the public as compared to the hardship imposed on the petitioner.
No, due to the long-term traffic impact on the Village of Barrington.
15. The suitability of the particular property for which the property is now zoned.
Yes.
16. Not applicable
17. The care with which the community has undertaken to plan its land use development
No. It should be very low density, in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan.
18. Not applicable.

Commissioner Morrissey questioned number 2, in that the number of buildings may create a certain density, however the square footage of the buildings themselves seems to be okay.

Commissioner Burroughs noted that the Plan Commission's interpretation is to be low density, not the maximum density allowed by ordinance.

Commissioner Sidhu noted that because this is a special use, it allows the Village more flexibility to chose the density.

Chairperson Bush restated the motion as follows:

MOTION: Vice-Chairperson Larsen moved and Commissioner Morrissey seconded a motion to approve the statement of findings of fact as previously stated.

ROLL CALL: Commissioner Morrissey, aye; Commissioner Sidhu, aye; Commissioner Burroughs, aye; Commissioner Mack, aye; Vice-Chairperson Larsen, aye; Chairperson Bush, aye. Commissioner Rometty was absent. Chairperson Bush declared the motion passed.

MOTION: Vice-Chairperson Larsen moved and Commissioner Morrissey seconded a motion to recommend approval the petition with following conditions:

1. There will be one (1) building only, the proposed Clark Bardes Corporate Headquarters, as presented, not to exceed 40,000 square feet including the underground parking.
2. There will be no subdivision allowed.
3. Stay within guidelines of Comprehensive Plan for the very low density.
4. Lot 5 is in violation of Standard Five of the Special Use Ordinance and should remain as open space. Although Lot 5 is not part of the petition, Lot 5 is mentioned in the potential intergovernmental agreement and should be included in this motion.

Commissioner Morrissey clarified that the final approval is for one (1) building (Clark Bardes). This addresses the issue that came about at the last meeting of the desire for us to “un-couple” this project into phases. Commissioner Morrissey hoped that the petitioner would agreed that this is a good middle ground.

Chairperson Bush noted that she’d be happy to straighten out the property dimensions with the annexation/ disconnection and make a useable piece of property. She also noted that Clark Bardes will be an asset to the location.

ROLL CALL: Commissioner Morrissey, aye; Commissioner Sidhu, aye; Commissioner Burroughs, aye; Commissioner Mack, aye; Vice-Chairperson Larsen, aye; Chairperson Bush, aye. Commissioner Rometty was absent. Chairperson Bush declared the motion passed.

Keith Sbiral, Senior Planner, noted that the next step is that staff will put together a Plan Commission referral letter with the findings of fact and forward to the Board of Trustees at their May 27th board meeting.

Mr. Best clarified that the Plan Commission favorably recommended the annexation/ disconnection. Chairperson Bush said yes and that it would be included in their referral letter to the Board.

MOTION: Commissioner Morrissey moved and Commissioner Mack seconded a motion to adjourn the Plan Commission meeting of May 6, 2003 at approximately 7:25 p.m. The voice vote noted all ayes and the motion carried.

Adjournment

Mr. Larsen moved and Mr. Mack seconded to adjourn the meeting. Voice vote recorded all ayes. The Motion carried. The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Melanie Marcordes

Anna Bush, Chairperson
Plan Commission